



Via Federal Express

January 9, 2015

Ms. Elizabeth Butler
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region II
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007-1866

Re: Site Characterization Summary Report
Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study Activities
Riverside Industrial Park Superfund Site - Essex County, Newark, New Jersey
CERCLA Docket No. 02-2014-2011

Dear Ms. Butler:

On behalf of PPG Industries, Inc., Woodard & Curran is hereby transmitting one hard copy and two electronic copies of the revised Site Characterization Summary Report for remedial investigation and feasibility study activities at the Riverside Industrial Park Superfund Site. The report is submitted in accordance with the above Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent (ASAOC) and accompanying Statement of Work (Task I).

Please contact Mr. Thomas Ebbert, Project Coordinator, should you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

WOODARD & CURRAN



Kenneth J. Bird, LSRP
Senior Vice President

KJB/cld
Project No. 0013620.10
Attachment

cc: Mr. Thomas Ebbert – PPG Industries, Inc.
William J. Reilly, Esq. – USEPA, Region II (w/o attachment)
Peter T. Stinson, Esq. – Dickie McCamey & Chilcote, P.C.

January 9, 2015



Ms. Elizabeth Butler
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region II
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007-1866

Re: Transmittal – Comment/Response Document
Site Characterization Summary Report (SCSR) July 2014
Riverside Industrial Park Superfund Site
Newark, New Jersey

Dear Ms. Butler:

On behalf of PPG Industries, Woodard & Curran, herein provides responses to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) comments of December 19, 2014, regarding the Site Characterization Summary Report (SCSR) of July 2014 for the above-referenced site.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

COMMENT NO. 1: The Executive Summary and Introduction should clearly explain that the purpose of this document is to assist with the planning of the RI/FS Work Plan by evaluating the existing data, developing a preliminary CSM and identifying data gaps; and further it should clarify that it will be amended after collection of the RI data before it ultimately gets incorporated into the future RI Report after EPA approval.

✓ **Response:** The SCSR, specifically the Executive Summary and Introduction sections, have been revised to address this comment.

COMMENT NO. 2: In Sections 2.7, 4.1.1, 6.1.1 and elsewhere throughout the document where statements are made about DEP's designation of the Site as a "historic fill area" or where conclusions are made about the status of soil or groundwater as it relates to "historic fill," it should be made clear whether DEP actually stated that in writing as part of the various Lot investigations or whether this was just determined from their *2004 Historic Fill Map*. Additionally, any previous DEP designations need to be confirmed with DEP and, therefore, should be considered a data gap as we move forward with the RI work planning process.

✓ **RESPONSE:** The SCSR presents information about historical fill for the various lots as documented in the references (Section 7.0). The historic fill designation is a combination of 1) New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) approval of responsible party documents with this designation (Lots 1, 58, 60, 62, 66, and 70); 2) review of the New Jersey Geological Survey historical fill maps; and 3) NJDEP approval of deed notices with engineering controls for historical fill (Lots 61, 63, 68, 70). This clarifying text is added to Section 2.7.

In 2003, in response to Brownfield Act New Jersey Statutes Annotated (N.J.S.A.) 58:10B-35h(1), the NJDEP adopted guidance for identifying and remediating historic fill material. In 2013, NJDEP developed their most recent historical fill guidance. It is recognized that some historical fill determinations predate both the 2003 and 2013 guidance. The 2013 guidance is



g = ck w/ Marian + Bill

an Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement (ARAR) considered during the remedial investigation (RI)/feasibility study (FS).

✓ PPG will seek confirmation from NJDEP of the historical fill references at the Site, which have been added as a data gap to Table 3.

COMMENT NO. 3: In Section 4.4 and elsewhere throughout the document it is assumed that the previously collected data is "acceptable for the purpose of this report," but no information was provided regarding the QA/QC or type of evaluation performed of the data to make that assumption. It appears some existing data had more information than others, therefore, there may be limitations to the acceptability of the data pending its use. Although it is EPA's intention to make use of the existing data to the extent practicable, the quality of the data will determine whether it can be used for site characterization, risk assessment, enforcement or none of the above. In general, if DEP has accepted the data for site characterization purposes, EPA intends to do the same, but further evaluation will be necessary to determine if it is of sufficient quality for other purposes. Please provide additional information as to how the acceptability determination was made. In addition, summary tables of the data including the number of samples, sample depths, limits, etc. would be useful in determining what additional data needs to be collected.

○ **RESPONSE:** Quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) evaluation was not conducted on Site data presented in the SCSR. The data were contained within various documents submitted to the NJDEP, and those provided by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Some of the documents only contained tabular results with no supporting laboratory reports. The historical data in the SCSR are considered to be appropriate for screening purposes and for preliminary determination of areas of concern (AOC) and contaminants of concern. This clarification was added to Section 4.4. The RI/FS work plan and accompanying Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) will describe the acquisition of new data from the Site to confirm previous findings, and will be validated according to the AOC. If historical data are used for risk assessment or other purposes, its quality for that purpose will be evaluated and presented in the RI report.

Summary tables are provided in Appendix D (Sample Location Maps and Results Tables), and a database of the results is provided in Appendix F.

COMMENT NO. 4: This document identifies a number of chemicals for which there is a lack of toxicity information as well as chemicals that may require special analytical techniques. This needs to be considered during future evaluations and in development of the RI/FS Work plan.

* **RESPONSE:** Comment acknowledged. Chemicals lacking toxicity information will be reviewed to determine whether there are suitable, structurally similar compounds that may be used as toxicological surrogates in order to evaluate potential health risks. During the planning stages of the RI (i.e., in the work plan), and later in the Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment (BHHRA), these chemicals and any appropriate surrogates will be identified and discussed. If no suitable toxicological surrogates are identified, then potential health risks related to these chemicals will be addressed qualitatively in the Uncertainty Analysis of the BHHRA.

The RI/FS Work Plan and the QAPP will list analytical techniques.



COMMENT NO. 5: Since a number of institutional/engineering controls have already been put in place on the various Lots comprising the Site, it would be helpful to put together a map showing all of the areas with deed restrictions and engineering controls and a second map showing all of the areas covered by CEAs. These remedial actions will need to be evaluated as we look at all 15 Lots as one Site in light of the future use determinations for the Site.

✓ **RESPONSE:** Figure 26 has been added showing the known deed restrictions and engineering controls. Figure 27 shows the known Classification Exception Areas (CEAs) for the Site. These engineering and institutional controls will be confirmed in the RI.

COMMENT NO. 6: Due to the varying uses of this Site, a major consideration moving forward will be the determination of the anticipated future land use. In development of the RI/FS Work Plan, information should be obtained from the various Lot owners regarding any current or future plans for those Lots.

OK **RESPONSE:** An RI/FS task includes interviews with lot owners and local government agencies to determine current and future land-use plans. PPG will seek to obtain this information during implementation of the Reuse Assessment Plan.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

COMMENT NO. 1: Section 1.1, p. 1-1 – Delete “Focused” from “Focused Feasibility Study”.

✓ **RESPONSE:** “Focused” was deleted.

COMMENT NO. 2: Section 3.8.1, p 3-8 – EPA does not agree with the last couple of sentences in this section characterizing the quality of the data. To clarify, EPA previously stated in a June 17, 2014 email to PPG that EPA has reason to question analytical laboratory result data for samples taken at the Riverside Avenue Site. The email further stated that EPA is not able to say that these data are of known quality and the samples in question were provided by EPA to PPG in an attachment to the June 17, 2014 email. Also in that email, EPA requested that PPG not use the data in its SCSR for the Site. EPA’s position on this remains the same today as it did on June 17, 2014, therefore, please revise those last 2 sentences as follows: “The results of the investigation were reviewed; however, USEPA requested that PPG not use this data in its Site Characterization Summary Report for the Site because USEPA is not able to say that these data are of known quality.” This clarification should be made in any other places in the document where the data from the June 17, 2014 email are discussed as well.

✓ **RESPONSE:** Section 3.8.1 has been revised.

COMMENT NO. 3: Section 4.3, p. 4-4 – In the first paragraph, the statement about the flow of the Passaic River should be corrected to indicate that the river is tidal in the area of the Site.

✓ **RESPONSE:** Section 4.3 has been revised.

COMMENT NO. 4: Section 4.4, p. 4-5 – The screening analysis relies on the Industrial Regional Screening Levels as a basis of comparison but does not indicate the level used.



de w/ Marion

★ **RESPONSE:** The results tables in Appendix D provide the screening levels utilized for the SCSR. This clarification was added to Section 4.4.

Typically, for an initial screening, the risk assessment relies on residential screening levels at a risk level of 10-6 and an HI = 0.1 to assure that chemicals are not prematurely removed from consideration.

★ **RESPONSE:** Residential screening levels will initially be utilized for the risk assessment and will only include validated data.

COMMENT NO. 5: Section 4.4.2, p. 4-7 – What is DEP’s classification of groundwater in the area?

✓ **RESPONSE:** NJDEP Class II-A groundwater classification was added in Section 4.4.2.

COMMENT NO. 6: Section 4.4.2, p. 4-8 – In the 2nd para, the sentence that starts with “Some of these effects...” seems to be incomplete.

✓ **RESPONSE:** The sentence was revised to address this comment.

COMMENT NO. 7: Section 5.4, p. 5-2 – The current potential receptors should be identified in addition to the potential receptor pathways. These two items will need to be updated once the future land use is determined. Risk assessments are based on current and future land use. Completion of the Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund Part D Table 1 would be helpful with this task.

✓ ★ **RESPONSE:** Both current and future receptors and potential exposure pathways have been identified for the Site. Section 5.4 has been revised to also include current potential receptors. This information is summarized in a table following the format of Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund (RAGS) Part D Table 1, and is included in the revised report as Table 2.

COMMENT NO. 8: Section 6.6, p 6-7 – Insert “Gas” after “Soil” in the last bullet.

✓ **RESPONSE:** The bullet was revised accordingly.

COMMENT NO. 9: Section 6.7, p 6-7 – Delete the sentence about the Passaic River immediately following the bullets.

✓ **RESPONSE:** The sentence was deleted.

COMMENT NO. 10: Table 3 – Add “Human Health Risk” as a Data Gap with “Determine future land use and potential receptors” as the Tasks To Address Data Gaps.

✓ **RESPONSE:** Table 3 was revised to address this comment (Table 4 in revised report). The Data Gap table will also be revised in the SCSR addendum to reflect collected RI data.

COMMENT NO. 11: Table 3 – Under Tasks for the Surface Soil and Source Definition Data Gap, add “Confirm “historic fill” designation”.



✓ **RESPONSE:** Table 3 was revised to address this comment (Table 4 in revised report). The Data Gap table will also be revised in the SCSR addendum to reflect collected RI data.

The SCSR was revised based upon the comments and responses above. The revised SCSR is being submitted separately.

If these responses do not adequately address the Agency's comments or you have questions regarding these responses, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted,
WOODARD & CURRAN

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kenneth J. Bird".

Kenneth J. Bird, LSRP
Senior Vice President

KJB/cld
Project No. 0013620.10

Cc: Mr. Thomas Ebbert – PPG Industries, Inc.
William J. Reilly, Esq. – USEPA, Region II
Peter T. Stinson, Esq. – Dickie McCamey & Chilcote, P.C.